Only one who is eternally free from earthly passions can apprehend Tao's spiritual essence. —*Tao Te King*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 56 JUNE, 1968 NUMBER 8

ROBERT CROSBIE

THE founder of this magazine, Robert Crosbie, is not often mentioned in these pages. This is natural enough. The habit of his life is transmitted in the fruit of his works, and this is as he would have it. No man succeeded so well in losing his identity in the Theosophical Movement. This was the example he set for U.L.T. Not everyone, in the days in which he was alive, was susceptible to the simplicities of his expression. Yet there were those who saw the strength in what he said and did, and recognized the fitness of the idea of a Theosophical association of students that would flourish on its moral worth alone. They learned from him and followed his example, and showed that it was within the competence of ordinary people to hold together and work for Theosophy simply by the attraction of an impersonal ideal.

As with Mr. Crosbie, little space is devoted in THEOSOPHY to the United Lodge of Theosophists. What is there to say? Theosophy is the thing, not the less than perfect vehicle for its dissemination and spread. The continuity of U.L.T. depends upon the continuity of its original inspiration, recreated deliberately, from day to day and year to year, in the lives of associates. Its instruments are few: the Declaration, the books, the meetings—and that sense of help and hope for the world that lies behind all striving in behalf of brotherhood and truth. These instruments need no elaborate explanation or commentary. They have their natural function as students use and embody them. There is nothing complicated about it at all.

The Theosophical Movement may be likened to a relay race. Its work is handed on by one generation to the next. Its activity is unceasing although its visibility may vary from cycle to cycle. We hardly know of its beginnings, except in metaphysical principle, but each student committed to the work must have a long egoic history of connection with its course. Outside identities have their names and casual forms, but these appear and disappear like the leaves of a tree. Who were we, in past cycles? We do not know, save that we were busy at some task that needed to be done. Names are forgotten, but the work persists. It grows and flowers only as there are Companions in the world who cleave to the principles and methods of work, letting other matters go.

Cycles bring ups and downs, but students work in the spirit of fearing no failure, courting no success. And what more reward is needed than to see the light in the eyes of one who comes, hears, then knows that he has found again the path of destiny? So are the bonds of this association formed, the brotherhood cemented, as each one does for others what has been done for him.

So, the work goes on. This was always its way, and it will never have another. Mr. Crosbie gave a kind of self-evidence to the modes and meanings of this work. We mention him seldom, but we do not forget.

BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

He who does not feel competent to grasp the noble idea sufficiently to work for it, need not undertake a task too heavy for him. But there is hardly a Theosophist in the whole Society unable to effectually help it by correcting erroneous impressions of outsiders, if not by actually propagating the ideas himself. Oh! for noble and unselfish men to help us effectually in that divine task! All our knowledge, past and present, would not be sufficient to repay them. . . . To be true, religion and philosophy must offer the solution of every problem. That the world is in such a bad condition, morally, is a conclusive evidence that none of its religions and philosophies—those of the civilized races less than any other—has ever possessed the TRUTH.

—FROM THE GREAT MASTER'S LETTER

OF OCCULT POWERS AND THEIR ACQUIREMENT

THERE are thousands of people in the United States, as well in the ranks of the Society as outside, who believe that there are certain extraordinary occult powers to be encompassed by man. Such powers as thought reading, seeing events yet to come, unveiling the motives of others, apportation of objects, and the like, are those most sought after, and nearly all desired with a selfish end in view. The future is inquired into so as to enable one to speculate in stocks and another to circumvent competitors. These longings are pandered to here and there by men and societies who hold out delusive hopes to their dupes that, by the payment of money, the powers of nature may be invoked.

Even some of our own members have not been guiltless of seeking after such wonderful fruit of knowledge with those who would barter the Almighty, if they could, for gold.

Another class of earnest theosophists, however, have taken a different ground. They have thought that certain Adepts who really possess power over nature, who can both see and hear through all space, who can transport solid objects through space and cause written messages to appear at a distance with beautiful sounds of astral bells, ought to intervene, and by the exercise of the same power make these earnest disciples hear sounds ordinarily called occult, and thus easily transmit information and help without the aid of telegraph or mailboat. But that these Beings will not do this has been stated over and over again; for the kingdom of heaven is not given away, it must be "taken by violence." It lies there before us to be entered upon and occupied, but that can be only after a battle which, when won, entitles the victor to remain in undisturbed possession.

As many have seemed to forget these rules, I thought it well to offer them the following words from one of those very Adepts they seek to meet:

NOTE.—This article, first published in the *Path* for February, 1889, has been previously reprinted in THEOSOPHY.

"The educing of the faculty of hearing occult sounds would be not at all the easy matter you imagine. It was never done to any one of us, for the iron rule *is* that what powers one gets he *must himself acquire,* and when acquired and ready for use, the powers lie dumb and dormant in their potentiality like the wheels in a music box, and only then is it easy to wind the key and start them. * * * Yet every earnestly-disposed man *may* acquire such powers practically; that is the finality of it. There are no more distinctions of persons in this than there are as to whom the sun shall shine upon or the air give vitality to. There are the powers of all nature before you; *take what you can.*"

This is perfectly clear and strictly according to the Secret Canon. "When the materials are all prepared and ready, the architect shall appear"; and when we have *acquired* the powers we seek, by educing them ourselves from our inner being, the Master will then be ready and able to start into exercise that which we have obtained.

But—even here is an important point. This. If the Master can, so to say, wind the key and thus start the machinery, He can also refuse to give the necessary impulse. For reasons that have to do with the motives and life of students, it may be advisable for a while not to permit the exercise of these powers which "lie dumb and dormant in their potentiality." To sanction their use in one might lead to the ruin of other lives, or in another to personal disaster and retardation of true progress.

Therefore the Master says that quite often he may not only refuse to give the start, but yet further may prevent the wheels from moving.

THERE ARE THE POWERS OF ALL NATURE BEFORE YOU; TAKE WHAT YOU CAN.

RODRIGUEZ UNDIANO

THE DOCTRINE OF INACTION

WHERE is the person who has not marveled at the salutary force unceasingly at work in Nature to restore harmony and equilibrium? Consider, for example, the pond of water and its inherent tendency to remain calm. One may upset the calm with pebble or boulder, or a violent windstorm may come and produce furious waves. But however intense the disturbance created, and however long it is sustained, it is the quiet, unceasing urge toward equilibrium, all unheard and unseen by man, that will ultimately prevail. For the one decree of Karma, it is said, is that *harmony must be restored.* The ancient Chinese sage, Lao-tse, was profoundly conscious of Nature's Law of Harmony. It was from observation of this Law that he developed his famous "Doctrine of Inaction."

> Who is there that can make muddy water clear? But if allowed to remain still, it will gradually become clear of itself. Who is there that can secure a state of absolute repose? But let time go on, and the state of repose will gradually arise. Be of sparing speech, and things will come right of themselves.
>
> Tao is eternally inactive, and yet it leaves nothing undone. If kings and princes could hold fast to this principle, all things would work out their own reformation.
>
> Keep the mouth shut, close the gateways of the senses, and as long as you live you will have no trouble. Open your lips and push your affairs, and you will not be safe to the end of your days. Leave all things to take their natural course, and do not interfere. (*Tao Teh King.*)

In an article titled "Spiritual Progress," first published in the *Theosophist* for May, 1885, H. P. Blavatsky took special note of this powerful yet peaceable Law of Inaction. Aspiring Theosophists of that day, it seems, were over-zealous in their efforts toward spiritual cultivation. They were striving furiously to be calm! "Evil," she said, "is often the result of over-anxiety, and men are always trying to do too much; they are not content to leave well enough alone, to do always just what the occasion demands and no more; they exag-

gerate every action and so produce karma to be worked out in a future birth." (THEOSOPHY 34:90.)

Lao-tse's paradox, "Tao is eternally inactive, and yet it leaves nothing undone," is reminiscent of Jesus' statement: "Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. . . . Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." (Matt. 6: 26-29.) Jesus was explaining the doctrine of inaction. He was assuring his disciples that there is a power in life, whether we call it God, Tao, or Karma, that will supply their every need, and heal their every ill, if only they would understand it and trust it. Consider, for example, the dynamic yet inconspicuous *healing power* that is locked up in all life, ceaselessly at work to restore health, harmony, and equilibrium to all that lives. Whence comes this healing power, if it is not innate in Nature? "Nature," says H.P.B. (*S.D.* I, 277fn.), "taken in its abstract sense, *cannot* be 'unconscious' . . . . Where is that daring man who would presume to deny to vegetation and even to minerals *a consciousness of their own?*"

The intelligent physician, though he may know little of the doctrine of inaction, realizes that neither he nor his medicines actually cure diseases. Healing is the work of Tao, or of the cosmic intelligence of "the lives." All that any doctor can do is to help or to hinder natural healing processes by a more respectful observance of Nature's innate power of healing, and, by working with it, contribute much to the health and well-being of mankind.

But man, on his part, must also work with Nature, obeying her laws. Jesus made this interaction clear when he said: "Seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink. . . . But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you." (Luke 12:29, 31.) Metaphorically, the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of Heaven (Buddhi), is a state of harmony throughout the organism; for man, it is one in which the sattvic qualities are dominant. These qualities tend to harmonize the whole being, whereas the rajasic and tamasic qualities disrupt the harmonious flow of the life-forces. (This has been recognized by Dr. John A. Schindler, who says: "The healthy emotions, such as equanimity, resignation, courage, determination, and cheerfulness, stimulate the pituitary to produce an optimal hormone spectrum, an effect with

far greater power for good health than any drug, or set of drugs, that we know anything about.") "Help Nature and work on with her" is a dictum that is potent for good at every level of our being.

At the purely physiological level, fasting is an application of the doctrine of inaction. It is based upon the principle that the body, if left alone, knows how to heal itself, just as muddy water, undisturbed, will clear itself. And the practice of fasting is gradually being recognized as one of the surest, quickest, and least expensive roads to bodily health and repose. Except in extreme or chronic cases, or where surgery is required, a simple fast is often all that is required to restore the body to health. Did not King Jehoshaphat proclaim "a fast throughout all Judah"? (II Chron, 20:3) And did not Jesus recommend the practice to his disciples when he said: "But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret"? (Matt. 6:17-18.) One who fasts applies the principle of inaction. He discontinues all those unwise habits of eating and drinking that have caused the disease. He falls back, in other words, upon life's great Healer and Adjuster, which is Tao, the SELF (or God), manifesting in life as Law or KARMA.

Is it possible that such were the reflections of David when he said that the Lord "healeth all thy diseases"? Could he have meant, as Jesus and Lao-tse evidently did, that while God or Nature or Tao, though seeming to do nothing, *are* incessantly acting; that there is a cosmic intelligence perpetually at work, healing all ills and providing all needs; and that we, through unwise habits of body and mind, are continually interfering with this restorative process?

Lao-tse's Doctrine of Inaction should be put in perspective, however, by also considering Krishna's discussion of action in inaction, and inaction in action. Action at one level imposes inaction at another. He who knows how to balance the two is a wise man, as Krishna shows in the fifth chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita*:

> Children only and not the wise speak of renunciation of action and of right performance of action as being different. He who perfectly practices the one receives the fruits of both, and the place which is gained by the renouncer of action is also attained by him who is devoted in action. . . . Whoever in acting dedicates his actions to the Supreme Spirit and puts aside all selfish interest in their result is untouched by sin. . . . The self-restrained sage having with his heart renounced all actions, dwells at rest in the "nine-gate city of his abode," neither acting nor causing to act.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHEME

GNOSIS AND CHRISTIANITY: PRE-CHRISTIAN SYSTEMS

IT is alleged that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, and yet it contains the account of his own death (Deut. 34:6); and in Genesis (14:14), the name Dan is given to a city, which Judges (18:29), tells us was only called by that name at that late day, it having previously been known as Laish. Well might Josiah have rent his clothes when he had heard the words of the Book of the Law; for there was no more of Moses in it than there is of Jesus in the Gospel according to John.

We have one fair alternative to offer our theologians, leaving them to choose for themselves, and promising to abide by their decision. Only they will have to admit, either that Moses was an impostor, or that his books are forgeries, written at different times and by different persons; or, again, that they are full of fraudulent interpolations. In either case the work loses all claims to be considered divine *Revelation*. Here is the problem, which we quote from the Bible—the word of the God of Truth:

"And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name of JEHOVAH was I not known to them" (Exod. 6:3), spake God unto Moses.

A very startling bit of information that, when, before arriving at the book of Exodus, we are told in Genesis (22:14) that "Abraham called the name of that place"—where the patriarch had been preparing to cut the throat of his only-begotten son—"JEHOVAH-jireh!" (Jehovah sees.) Which is the inspired text?—both cannot be—which the forgery?

Now, if both Abraham and Moses had not belonged to the same holy group, we might, perhaps, help theologians by suggesting to them a convenient means of escape out of this dilemma. They ought to call the reverend Jesuit Fathers—especially those who have been missionaries in India—to their rescue. The latter would not be for

---

NOTE.—"The Christian Scheme," begun in November, 1967, is collated from the works of H. P. Blavatsky. It recounts the historical background and early development of Christianity.

a moment disconcerted. They would coolly tell us that beyond doubt Abraham had heard the name of Jehovah and *borrowed* it from Moses. Do they not maintain that it was they who invented the *Sanscrit,* edited *Manu,* and composed the greater portion of the *Vedas?*

Marcion maintained, with the other Gnostics, the fallaciousness of the idea of an incarnate God, and therefore denied the corporeal reality of the living body of Christ. His entity was a mere *illusion;* it was not made of human flesh and blood, neither was it born of a human mother, for his divine nature could not be polluted with any contact with sinful flesh. He accepted Paul as the only apostle preaching the pure gospel of truth, and accused the other disciples of "depraving the pure form of the gospel doctrines delivered to them by Jesus, mixing up matters of the Law and the words of the Saviour."

Finally we may add that modern biblical criticism, which unfortunately became really active and serious only toward the end of the last century, now generally admits that Marcion's text of the only gospel he knew anything about—that of Luke, is far superior and by far more correct than that of our present Synoptics. We find in *Supernatural Religion* the following (for every Christian) startling sentence: "We are, therefore, *indebted to Marcion* for *the correct version even* of *'the Lord's Prayer'."*

If, leaving for the present the prominent founders of Christian sects, we now turn to that of the Ophites, which assumed a definite form about the time of Marcion and the Basilideans, we may find in it the reason for the *heresies* of all others. Like all other Gnostics, they rejected the Mosaic Bible entirely. Nevertheless, their philosophy, apart from some deductions original with several of the most important founders of the various branches of Gnosticism was not new. Passing through the Chaldean kabalistic tradition, it gathered its materials in the Hermetic books, and pursuing its flight still farther back for its metaphysical speculations, we find it floundering among the tenets of Manu, and the earliest Hindu ante-sacerdotal genesis. Many of our eminent antiquarians trace the Gnostic philosophies right back to Buddhism, which does not impair in the least either their own or our arguments. We repeat again, *Buddhism is but the primitive source of Brahmanism.* It is not against the primitive *Vedas* that Gautama protests. It is against the sacerdotal and official state religion of his country; and the Brahmans, who in order

to make room for and give authority to the castes, at a later period crammed the ancient manuscripts with interpolated slokas, intended to prove that the castes were predetermined by the Creator by the very fact that each class of men was issued from a more or less noble limb of Brahma. Gautama-Buddha's philosophy was that taught from the beginning of time in the impenetrable secrecy of the inner sanctuaries of the pagodas. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find again, in all the fundamental dogmas of the Gnostics, the metaphysical tenets of both Brahmanism and Buddhism. They held that the Old Testament was the revelation of an inferior being, a subordinate divinity, and did not contain a single sentence of their *Sophia,* the Divine Wisdom. As to the New Testament, it had lost its purity when the compilers became guilty of interpolations. The revelation of divine truth was sacrificed by them to promote selfish ends and maintain quarrels. The accusation does not seem so very improbable to one who is well aware of the constant strife between the champions of circumcision and the "Law," and the apostles who had given up Judaism.

The Gnostic Ophites taught the doctrine of Emanations, so hateful to the defenders of the unity in the trinity, and *vice versa.* The Unknown Deity with them had *no name;* but his first female emanation was called Bythos or Depth.[1] It answered to the Shekinah of the kabalists, the "Veil" which conceals the "Wisdom" in the *cranium* of the highest of the *three* heads. As the Pythagorean Monad, this *nameless* Wisdom was the *Source* of Light, and *Ennoia* or Mind, is Light itself. The latter was also called the "Primitive Man," like the Adam Kadmon, or ancient Adam of the *Kabala.* Indeed, if man was created after his likeness and in the image of God, then this God was like his creature in shape and figure—hence, he is the "Primitive man." The first Manu, the one evolved from Swayambhuva, "he who exists unrevealed in his own glory," is also, in one sense, the primitive man, with the Hindus.

Thus the "nameless and the unrevealed," Bythos, his female reflection, and Ennoia, the revealed Mind proceeding from both, or their Son are the counterparts of the Chaldean first triad as well as those of the Brahmanic Trimurti. We will compare: in all the three systems we see

---

[1] We give the systems according to an old diagram preserved among some Kopts and the Druses of Mount Lebanon. Irenæus had perhaps some good reasons to disfigure their doctrines.

THE GREAT FIRST CAUSE as the ONE, the primordial germ, the unrevealed and grand ALL, existing through himself. In the

INDIAN PANTHEON.	THE CHALDEAN.	IN THE OPHITE.
Brahma-Zyaus.	Ilu, Kabalistic En-Soph.	The Nameless, or Secret Name.

Whenever the Eternal awakes from its slumber and desires to manifest itself, it divides itself into male and female. It then becomes in every system

THE DOUBLE-SEXED DEITY, The universal Father and Mother.

IN INDIA.	IN CHALDEA.	IN THE OPHITE SYSTEM.
Brahma.	Eikon or En-Soph.	Nameless Spirit.
Nara (male), Nari (female).	Anu (male), Anata (female).	Abrasax (male), Bythos (female).

From the union of the two emanates a third, or creative Principle —the SON, or the manifested Logos, the product of the Divine Mind.

IN INDIA.	IN CHALDEA.	OPHITE SYSTEM.
Viradj, the Son.	Bel, the Son.	Ophis (another name for Ennoia), the Son.

Moreover, each of these systems has a triple male trinity, each proceeding separately through itself from one female Deity. So, for instance:

IN INDIA.	IN CHALDEA.	IN THE OPHITE SYSTEM.
The Trinity — Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, are blended into ONE, who is *Brahmä* (neuter gender), creating and being created through the Virgin Nari (the mother of perpetual fecundity).	The trinity — Anu, Bel, Hoa (or Sin, Samas, Bin), blend into ONE who is Anu (double-sexed) through the Virgin Mylitta.	The trinity consisted of the Mystery named Sigè, Bythos, Ennoia. These become ONE who is *Abrasax,* from the Virgin *Sophia* (or *Pneuma*), who herself is an emanation of Bythos and the Mystery-god and emanates through them, Christos.

To place it still clearer, the Babylonian System recognizes first—the ONE (Ad, or Ad-ad), who is never named, but only acknowledged in thought as the Hindu Swayambhuva. From this he becomes manifest as Anu or Ana—the one above all—Monas. Next comes the Demiurge called Bel or Elu, who is the active power of the Godhead. The third is the principle of Wisdom, Hea or Hoa, who also

rules the sea and the underworld. Each of these has his divine consort, giving us Anata, Belta, and Davkina. These, however, are only like the *Saktis,* and not especially remarked by theologists. But the female principle is denoted by Mylitta, the Great Mother, called also Ishtar. So with the three male gods, we have the Triad or Trimurti, and with Mylitta added, the *Arba* or Four (Tetraktys of Pythagoras), which perfects and potentializes all. Hence, the above-given modes of expression. The following Chaldean diagram may serve as an illustration for all others:

Triad	Anu, Bel, Hoa,	Mylitta—Arba-il, or Four-fold God,

become, with the Christians,

Trinity	God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost,	Mary, or mother of these three Gods since they are one, or, the Christian Heavenly Tetraktys.

Though he is termed the "Primitive Man," Ennoia, who is like the Egyptian Pimander, the "Power of the Thought Divine," the first intelligible manifestation of the Divine Spirit in material form, he is like the "Only-Begotten" Son of the "Unknown Father," of all other nations. He is the emblem of the first appearance of the divine Presence in his own works of creation, tangible and visible, and therefore comprehensible. The mystery-God, or the ever-unrevealed Deity fecundates through His will Bythos, the unfathomable and infinite depth that exists in silence (Sigè) and darkness (for our intellect), and that represents the abstract idea of all nature, the ever-producing Cosmos. As neither the male nor female principle, blended into the idea of a double-sexed Deity in ancient conceptions, could be comprehended by an ordinary human intellect, the theology of every people had to create for its religion a Logos, or manifested word, in some shape or other. With the Ophites and other Gnostics who took their models direct from more ancient originals, the unrevealed Bythos and her male counterpart produce Ennoia, and the three in their turn produce Sophia,[2] thus completing the Tetraktys, which will emanate Christos, the very essence of the Father Spirit. As the unrevealed One, or concealed Logos

[2] Sophia is the highest prototype of woman—the first *spiritual* Eve. In the Bible the system is reversed and the intervening emanation being omitted, Eve is degraded to simple humanity.

in its latent state, he has existed from all eternity in the Arba-Il, the metaphysical abstraction; therefore, he is ONE with all others as a unity, the latter (including all) being indifferently termed, Sigè (silence), Bythos, etc. As the revealed one, he is Androgyne, Christos, and Sophia (Divine Wisdom), who descend into the man Jesus. Both Father and Son are shown by Irenæus to have loved the beauty (*formam*) of the primitive woman, who is Bythos—Depth—as well as Sophia, and as having produced conjointly Ophis and Sophia (doubled-sexed unity again), male and female wisdom, one being considered as the unrevealed Holy Spirit, or elder Sophia—the *Pneuma*—the intellectual "Mother of all things;" the other the revealed one, or *Ophis,* typifying divine wisdom fallen into matter, of God-man—Jesus, whom the Gnostic Ophites represented by the serpent (Ophis).

Fecundated by the Divine Light of the Father and Son, the highest spirit and Ennoia, Sophia produces in her turn two other emanations—one perfect Christos, the second imperfect Sophia-Achamoth, from hakhamoth (simple wisdom), who becomes the mediatrix between the intellectual and material worlds.

Christos was the mediator and guide between God (the Higher), and everything spiritual in man; Achamoth—the younger Sophia—held the same duty between the "Primitive man," Ennoia and matter. What was mysteriously meant by the general term, *Christos,* we have just explained.

Delivering a sermon on the "Month of Mary," we find the Rev. Dr. Preston, of New York City, expressing the Christian idea of the female principle of the trinity better and more clearly than we could, and substantially in the spirit of an ancient "heathen" philosopher. He says that the "plan of the redemption made it necessary that a mother should be found, and Mary stands pre-eminently alone as the only instance when a creature was necessary to the consummation of God's work." We will beg the right to contradict the reverend gentleman. As shown above, thousands of years before our era it was found necessary by all the "heathen" theogonies to find a female principle, a "mother" for the triune male principle. Hence, Christianity does not present the "only instance" of such a consummation of God's work—albeit, as this work shows, there was more philosophy and less materialism, or rather anthropomorphism, in it. But hear the reverend Doctor express "heathen" thought in Christian ideas. "He" (God), he says, "prepared her (Mary's) virginal

and celestial purity, for a mother defiled could not become the mother of the Most High. The holy virgin, even in her childhood, was more pleasing than all the Cherubim and Seraphim, and from infancy to the maturing maidenhood and womanhood she grew more and more pure. By her very sanctity she reigned over the heart of God. *When the hour came, the whole court of heaven was hushed, and the trinity listened for the answer of Mary, for without her consent the world could not have been redeemed."*

Does it not seem as if we were reading Irenæus explaining the Gnostic *"Heresy,* which taught that the Father and Son loved the beauty (*formam*) of the celestial Virgin?" or the Egyptian system, of Isis being both wife, sister, and mother of Osiris—Horus? With the Gnostic philosophy there were but *two,* but the Christians have improved and perfected the system by making it completely "heathen," for it is the Chaldean Anu—Bel—Hoa, merging into Mylitta. "Then while this month (of Mary)," adds Dr. Preston, "begins in the paschal season—the month when nature decks herself with fruits and flowers, the harbingers of a bright harvest—let us, too, begin for a golden harvest. In this month the dead comes up out of the earth, figuring the resurrection; so, when we are kneeling before the altar of the holy and immaculate Mary, let us remember that there should come forth from us the bud of promise, the flower of hope, and the imperishable fruit of sanctity."

This is precisely the substratum of the Pagan thought, which, among other meanings, emblematized by the rites of the resurrection of Osiris, Adonis, Bacchus, and other slaughtered sun-gods, the resurrection of all nature in spring, the germination of seeds that had been dead and sleeping during winter, and so were allegorically said to be kept in the underworld (Hades). They are typified by the three days passed in hell before his resurrection by Hercules, by Christ, and others.

This derivation, or rather *heresy,* as it is called in Christianity, is simply the Brahmanic doctrine in all its archaic purity. Vishnu, the second personage of the Hindu trinity, is also the Logos, for he is made subequently to incarnate himself in Christna. And Lakmy (or Lakshmy) who, as in the case of Osiris, and Isis, of En-Soph and Sephira, and of Bythos and Ennoia, is both his wife, sister, and daughter, through this endless correlation of male and female creative powers in the abstruse metaphysics of the ancient philosophies —is Sophia-Achamoth. Christna is the mediator promised by Brah-

ma to mankind, and represents the same idea as the Gnostic Christos. And Lakmy, Vishnu's spiritual half, is the emblem of physical nature, the universal mother of all the material and revealed forms; the mediatrix and protector of nature, like Sophia-Achamoth, who is made by the Gnostics the mediatrix between the Great Cause and Matter, as Christos is the mediator between him and spiritual humanity.

This Brahmano-Gnostic tenet is more logical, and more consistent with the allegory of Genesis and the fall of man. When God curses the first couple, He is made to curse also the earth and everything that is on it. The New Testament gives us a Redeemer for the first sin of mankind, which was punished for having sinned; but there is not a word said about a Saviour who would take off the unmerited curse from the earth and the animals, which had never sinned at all. Thus the Gnostic allegory shows a greater sense of both justice and logic than the Christian.

In the Ophite system, Sophia, the Androgyne Wisdom, is also the female spirit, or the Hindu female Nari (Narayana), moving on the face of the waters—chaos, or future matter. She vivifies it from afar, but not touching the abyss of darkness. She is unable to do so, for Wisdom is purely intellectual, and cannot act directly on matter. Therefore, Sophia is obliged to address herself to her Supreme Parent; but although life proceeds primarily from the Unseen Cause, and his Ennoia, neither of them can, any more than herself, have anything to do with the lower chaos in which matter assumes its definite shape. Thus, Sophia is obliged to employ on the task her *imperfect* emanation, Sophia-Achamoth, the latter being of a mixed nature, half spiritual and half material.

The only difference between the Ophite cosmogony and that of the St. John Nazarenes is a change of names. We find equally an identical system in the *Kabala,* the *Book of Mystery* (*Liber Mysterii*). All the three systems, especially that of the kabalists and the Nazarenes, which were the *models* for the Ophite Cosmogony, belong to the pure Oriental Gnosticism. The *Codex Nazaræus* opens with: "The Supreme King of Light, Mano, the great first one," etc., the latter being the emanation of Ferho—the unknown, formless LIFE. He is the chief of the Æons, from whom proceed (or shoot forth) five refulgent rays of Divine light. Mano is *Rex Lucis,* the Bythos-Ennoia of the Ophites. He is the Manifested Light around the highest of the three kabalistic heads, the concealed wisdom;

from him emanate the three *lives*. Æbel Zivo is the revealed Logos, Christos the "Apostle Gabriel," and the first Legate or messenger of light. If Bythos and Ennoia are the Nazarene Mano, then the dual-natured, the semi-spiritual, semi-material Achamoth must be Fetahil when viewed from her spiritual aspect; and if regarded in her grosser nature, she is the Nazarene "Spiritus."

Fetahil,[3] who is the reflection of his father, Lord Abatur, the *third* life—as the elder Sophia is also the third emanation—is the "newest-man." Perceiving his fruitless attempts to create a perfect material world, the "Spiritus" calls to one of her progeny, the Karabtanos—Ilda-Baoth—who is without sense or judgment ("blind matter"), to unite himself with her to create something definite out of this confused (*turbulentos*) matter, which task she is enabled to achieve only after having produced from this union with Karabtanos the seven stellars. Like the six sons or genii of the Gnostic Ilda-Baoth, they then frame the material world. The same story is repeated over again in Sophia-Achamoth. Delegated by her purely spiritual parent, the elder Sophia, to create the world of *visible forms,* she descended into chaos, and, overpowered by the emanation of matter, lost her way. Still ambitious to create a world of matter of her own, she busied herself hovering to and fro about the dark abyss, and imparted life and motion to the inert elements, until she became so hopelessly entangled in matter that, like Fetahil, she is represented sitting immersed in mud, and unable to extricate herself from it; until, by the contact of matter, she produces the *Creator* of the material world. He is the Demiurgus, called by the Ophites Ilda-Baoth, and, as we will directly show, the parent of the Jewish God in the opinion of some sects, and held by others to be the "Lord God" Himself. It is at this point of the kabalistic-gnostic cosmogony that begins the Mosaic Bible. Having accepted the Jewish Old Testament as their standard, no wonder that the Christians were forced by the exceptional position in which they were placed through their own ignorance, to make the best of it.

[3] Fetahil, sent to frame the world, finds himself immersed in the abyss of mud, and soliloquizes in dismay until the *Spiritus* (Sophia-Achamoth) unites herself completely with matter, and so creates the material world.

letters • questions • comment

The Secret Doctrine *states*: *"Such is the mysterious power of Occult symbolism, that the facts which have actually occupied countless generations of initiated seers and prophets to marshall, to set down and explain, in the bewildering series of evolutionary progress, are all recorded on a few pages of geometrical signs and glyphs." It is difficult to comprehend this fact—how can such a thing be possible? And why is symbolism considered so important in Theosophy?*

We use symbols constantly, but because we are not aware of doing so, the statement made by H. P. Blavatsky may not be understood. The word *symbol* (derived from the Greek) means "a sign by which one knows or infers a thing." Even before acquiring the power of speech, an infant unconsciously uses gestures as signs; an outstretched hand reaching toward a desired object represents that desire, a cry may indicate frustration or pain; a questioning facial expression tells of curiosity or puzzlement. As learning continues, the child finds that there are other ways besides gestures to communicate his thoughts and feelings. These more exact or specific symbols are called words. We seldom consider that a word is a mighty symbol, and that its expression can range in importance from representation of a physical object or action to the formulation of an abstract concept. The study of semantics shows the difficulties and dangers which arise when these symbols are used incorrectly, irresponsibly, and without due awareness of their various connotative meanings. For example "democracy" means something entirely different in societies based on different traditions, and "black power" means something different to various groups in the United States.

Thus, we see, it is the idea of *meaning* that gives importance and validity to a symbol.

In addition to word symbols there are graphic symbols, such as those used in mathematics, physics, chemistry, phonetics, music, etc. These symbols, however, are not intended for the enlightenment of the public, but are basic tools of the particular "discipline."

They have the advantage of brevity and of bridging the communication gap. Thus, a music score can be read at sight by anyone who understands the notation, regardless of language.

Individuals, too, stand as symbols. We might think of Gandhi in this sense. To express what he as a person "meant" or what his life signified would indeed be difficult, but if the mind is presented with the concept of Gandhi as a symbol of non-violent protest, the implications are filled with broad meaning, although this will depend upon the depth of individual understanding. Many of history's most illustrious names—and most infamous ones—are symbols of the idea or "cause" to which its bearer was dedicated.

Then there is the parable. The article "Teaching by Analogy" (THEOSOPHY for May) shows how all great religious teachers have used parable to make their teaching simple and understandable—and how many times Jesus used this method. In *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 307) we find this passage:

> Even a parable is a spoken symbol: a fiction or a fable as some think; an allegorical representation, we say, of life-realities, events, and facts. And, as a moral was ever drawn from a parable, that moral being an actual truth and fact in human life, so an historical, real event was deduced—by those versed in the hieratic sciences—from certain emblems and symbols recorded in the ancient archives of the temples. The religious and esoteric history of every nation was embedded in symbols; it was never expressed in so many words. All the thoughts and emotions, all the learning and knowledge, revealed and acquired, of the early races, found their pictorial expression in allegory and parable.

The rest of the passage explains why this is so. It also suggests why H.P.B. considered the symbols of occult science so important that she begins the Proem by describing and explaining some glyphs found on the pages of "an Archaic Manuscript—a collection of palm leaves made impermeable to water, fire, and air, by some specific unknown process." Indeed, the whole of *The Secret Doctrine* is an expansion of these glyphs as expressed in Stanzas from the *Book of Dzyan*—"a very old book," and an attempt to express these ideas in language comprehensible to Western minds.

Mr. Judge, also, discusses the importance of symbols in two articles, "Theosophical Symbolism" and "Theosophical Symbols," first published in the *Path* (reprinted, respectively, in THEOSOPHY 3: 488 and 4:74). In the latter, after describing the Theosophical Seal,

Mr. Judge says:

> Our seal points the mind to the regenerated man who, symbolized by the cross, stands in the centre enclosed by the light and the dark triangle, and encircled by the great serpent or dragon of evolution and matter. But an analysis of the different parts of the whole will aid us in understanding and grasping all its meanings. For in symbology the symbol is only right when it fitly represents all the ideas meant to be conveyed, and in all its parts is consistent with the whole, as well as being also in conformity to tradition and the rules of the ancients. It should also when understood be of such a character that when it is looked at or thought of, with the image of it in the mind, all the ideas and doctrines it represents recur to the thinker. This is why confused symbols are useless and right ones of the greatest use.

Symbols, then, suggest ideas that the mind may brood on, but which cannot be verbalized without setting limits to thought; they suggest that there is always something more to be discovered: they place the burden of full understanding on the inquirer. When the student asks, What does this symbol mean? the teacher replies: This and This and This—and whatever more your intuition may suggest.

Function of Symbols

Symbols direct and organize, record and communicate. In stating what they direct and organize, record and communicate we have to distinguish as always between Thoughts and Things. It is Thought which is directed and organized, and it is also Thought which is recorded and communicated. But just as we say that the gardener mows the lawn when we know that it is the lawn-mower which actually does the cutting, so, though we know that the direct relation of symbols is with thought, we also say that symbols record events and communicate facts.

—*The Meaning of Meaning*

MEDIUMSHIP

THERE is no more misunderstood or misapplied word than "Medium." Having been appropriated by the Spiritist, it is, as a natural result, to-day supposed to mean just what he makes it mean.

Men take a word, saddle it with a meaning, ride it rough shod on a full gallop over and into everything until other men shrink in terror from it; or else he stands and curses it for a while and curses it for a vile and useless thing. Those who have given the word its present meaning, ascribing all things to the work of disembodied spirits, have made the Medium what he is, and taking to their bosoms the Frankenstein whom they have raised—hug him close, whether he be angel or devil. So long as the Medium gives forth the utterances of *"Spirits"* it matters not at all whether they are the words of divine truth, pure lies, or the thoughts of the Medium; without the slightest true effort to discover the source, all is accepted and claimed for Spirits. This and some other modes of proceeding have discouraged many intelligent students from researches touching Mediumship, and caused all men, outside of a limited number, to distrust or fear the name.

Nevertheless Mediumship does exist, no matter how much it may be reviled or we be prejudiced against it. But Mediumship does not consist wholly in reality of so called communications from dead men, or the alleged materialization of Spirit forms through whose veins the red blood of Nature courses, and whose breaths frequently bear suspicious odor of onions. While there is not one of the phases of Spiritualism which is not founded upon a truth, yet these demonstrations almost generally are the results of unscrupulous persons seeking gain for self. A Medium gaining a little knowledge of some unfamiliar occult law, takes it for granted that all is learned, calls it a spirit, and immediately applies it to his own purposes. Finding he can go only a certain length with it, instead of seeking further

---

NOTE.—This article, first printed in the *Path* for November, 1887, and signed "Albertus" —pseudonym of Jasper Niemand—has appeared in previous volumes of THEOSOPHY.

knowledge, he strains and improvises upon it, to gain his ends or the gold he covets. We do not say they are not Mediums, for they are. All the charlatans and pretenders who cling to the skirts of Spiritism also. They are Mediums for the lower passions and elementals. The error of Spiritists lies in the fact that they ascribe *all* things to Spirits. Clairaudience, Clairvoyance, Psychometry, Hypnotism, etc., are all claimed as the work of a Spirit or Control.

All men are Mediums or Sensitives, and to what extent they little know. We do not claim that all men are Mediums for Spirits of dead men, or that they are all instruments for the most exalted Intelligences, but they are Mediums for Elementals—the embodied, the disembodied, for those who never have or may never be embodied —for all that the Astral holds, and sometimes for that which is beyond the Astral. They are Mediums for their own Inner and Higher selves or those of other men, and frequently failing to recognize them, they call them "Spirits."

The Psychometrist is a Medium or Sensitive, but he is such for the manifestation of the souls of things. The Hypnotic also, but he is for the manifestation of his own and the latent powers of other mortals. The Clairvoyant sees that which is recorded on the Astral.

The Clairaudient may hear the voices of Spirits, he may quite as easily hear the thought, but unspoken words, of other living men, the voices of forces or that of his own unrecognized Inner or Higher Self.

Upon the Astral Light all things are recorded; the knowledge of ages, the acts of all time, the forms of all who have died and all who live, the thoughts of all who have ever existed or do exist are photographed upon it. It has been and is being daily admitted more freely by wise men, that there are other forces and powers in Nature of which we, largely, have little knowledge. The souls of animate and inanimate things, the lights, colors and auras of non-luminous bodies, the powers of and forces exerted by immovable or quiescent things, and the effects of all these upon the human organism, are realized only to a slight extent by the enlightened and unprejudiced scientist, and fully known to the *true* occult student.

Thought passes to and fro from man to man. At a higher level it does the same from higher intelligences to man, and all in a sphere beyond the material. Men, from different causes, rising to different levels above their ordinary selves, come into the Astral where all is

spread out before them. They see and read only that for which they are fitted, and comprehend only that for which they are prepared. Through conscious or unconscious exaltation they rise into or come in contact with some current of thought or unspoken word which enters their brains by divers roads. Comprehended partly perhaps, but being entirely foreign to their normal personal manner of thinking—knowing they have heard a voice—it is ascribed to a Spirit, although in fact it may be the thought of a living man they hear, feel, see or are repeating. All men who by effort, training, or supersensitive personality, lift themselves consciously or are lifted unconsciously above the material, and secure the wisdom, knowledge and inspiration of other planes, are mediumistic.

Every student who has sought the Occult and attained his object has been a Medium, from Buddha, Pythagoras, Zoroaster, Apollonius, Plato, Jesus, Boehme, down to those of later times or of today.

The Adept as well as the Chela, the Initiate as well as the Neophyte, the Master as well as the Student. The Chela is but the Medium for his own latent possibilities—his Master and Nature's laws. The Neophyte likewise, for all by a striving for a high ideal, seek to place themselves upon a plane where Occult laws may make themselves visible or intelligible through their agency, and the silent voices of the Great Unseen become audible, be they individualized or diffused through all space as forces are. All things speak and convey a meaning, nothing is silent—all things speak from the monad, through all nature, forces, spheres, and space to the Omniscient silence—the ever living Word, the voice of the All Wise, and all men hear or feel some of these in some way and are Mediums for them.

Forces there are which wait but the will or desire of souls to spring into a certain degree of human intelligence, and make themselves heard to and through the one who has brought them into Material life.

Man's body is but a Medium. If it be not for his own Inner and Higher Self, then it is for those of other men; for we express the thoughts and acts of others quite as often as our own. There has never been a wise or good word spoken, a note of true music sounded, a line of true poetry penned, a harmonious blending of color painted that was not the result of Mediumship. There never was

an occult law explained, a divine mystery revealed through men, chela, student, Adept or Master, that was not the result of Mediumship.

The Master is higher than the chela who is his Medium. There is something higher than the Master, and he is Its Medium; looked at in its true light Mediumship is one of the wonders of the Creator. He who possesses most of this gift, realizing what it is and knowing how to wisely use it, may feel himself supremely blest. The Mystic and true Theosophist realizing what a Medium really is, may well hesitate before he joins with those who cast aside divine wisdom because it has come through an instrument declared in horror by some to be Mediumistic.

Occult Side of Nature

Law rules all the time from the very first beginning in the finest radiant matter. That matter was builded by beings of all grades of every kind—beings of a world which preceded this where they had their course of evolution and from which they were indrawn again to the Center of the Self. Then came the dawning of another Great Day of manifestation, and all those beings were there with all the potencies, the ideas, and all their past experience—once more to go forth and carry on the work which they had started. It is the action and reaction by different classes of beings which causes a change and concretion in primordial substance, and this goes on from stage to stage down through seven steps of the stairway of matter. On each plane the beings clothed themselves in the substance of that plane, and *we* are the beings who have come down through all those stages. There is, then, hidden within us a nature, and natures, which we have not suspected. There is something within us which is not clear to us with our present modes of perception. Yet these invisible natures are ours; they are not apart from us; we have not left them anywhere on the stairway of the seven worlds. This outside nature which we all perceive through the body and with the physical senses is only the external envelope of states and stages of consciousness hidden to the generality of mankind. There is an occult side not only to our own nature but to the nature of all beings. . . .

—Robert Crosbie

on the lookout

New Spirit in Science

Writing in *The Secret Doctrine* of the retreat of eminent nineteenth-century scientists from Positivist and materialist conceptions (I, 620), H. P. Blavatsky predicted that, eventually, scientists—

> will be driven out of their position not by spiritual, theosophical, or any other physical or even mental phenomena, but simply by the enormous *gaps* and *chasms* that open daily and will still be opening before them, as one discovery follows another, until they are finally knocked off their feet by the ninth wave of simple common sense.

It could be said that the revolution in scientific epistemology already under way, typified in the thought of Michael Polanyi (see his book, *Personal Knowledge* [University of Chicago Press, 1958], and his later, smaller work, *The Tacit Dimension* [Anchor paperback]) is accounted for by just such a "ninth wave of simple common sense," to which, in Polanyi's case, strong moral perception has been added. Polanyi is a chemist. Now comes a distinguished biologist, Catherine Roberts, whose measured declarations, in a new book, *The Scientific Conscience* (Braziller, 1967, paperback, $1.95), bear evidence of a similar inspiration. In 1961 Dr. Roberts gave up a successful career as a microbiologist to examine the philosophic issues involved in the practice of science. This book is the fruit of her reflections, made urgent by the tendency of modern biologists to regard the redesign of man, by manipulating his genetic constitution, as a wholly legitimate scientific undertaking. Dr. Roberts is horrified by the conceit of this assumption, and her book is devoted to showing its lack of foundation in either science or philosophy.

Neglect of Self-Knowledge

In her first chapter, titled "The Modern Biologist at the Crossroads," she says:

> Since it cannot be disputed that the pursuit of scientific truths

> is a praiseworthy endeavor, why, then, should we hesitate to give it our wholehearted support? It is because the modern biologist, in a kind of blind compulsion, overemphasizes the importance of his activity and fails to perceive that scientific knowledge has less ultimate value for the human race than knowledge of himself. And without self-knowledge, all his objective knowledge of living material and all the practical applications accruing therefrom will count for little—rather, the intensified pursuance of his work and the ensuing devaluation of human ideals for which he will be responsible might well be catastrophic for mankind.

"Self-knowledge," for Dr. Roberts, means what it meant to Socrates, and to the great Humanist figures of the Italian Renaissance. It means the rediscovery of the meaning of *arete*—the ancient Greek conception of Virtue; and it means giving this search for truth and knowledge of man's inner potentialities—which, she says, may not be "hereditary" at all—greater importance than biological undertakings.

Other Humanist Spokesmen

Dr. Roberts concludes her first chapter with this thoughtful summary of what is to be her theme:

> If the biologist's reflections eventually bring him to the conclusion that elevating the importance of humanistic ideals is synonymous with minimizing the importance of biology, and if he acts accordingly, what are the chief advantages apart from the repression of corruptive influences that stand to be gained? *To modern society*: by the gradual extinction of imminent perils in modern biology, the hope of a saner and more humanized world. *To the modern biologist*: by the gradual realization of his human potentialities, the hope of evolving into a whole man.
>
> These hopes are in no way original. Down through the centuries they have been thundered at mankind in various ways by those who felt they had a message of importance to convey to an erring world. In modern times, as in the past, these hopes have been expressed by men imbued with idealism—Albert Schweitzer, for example, with his repeated emphasis on respect for life; or Loren Eiseley, whose essay, "The Bird and the Machine," should be required reading for all biologists; or Benjamin Farrington, with his recent plea for a renewed study of the humanities; or Lewis Mumford, whose inspired views on the meaning and the renewal of life and on the whole man are a landmark in twentieth-century thought. In the face of the force and eloquence of these and similar messages, the moral indignation which prompted the present attempt is necessarily tempered with

humility. But in the belief that biology—this one facet of human activity—would do well to subordinate its present goals to the realization of the latent magnificence that already exists within us, also this attempt had to be made. It is for the biologist to decide whether it has been worth while.

The Higher Explains the Lower

But not only biologists should read Dr. Roberts' book, which is written in a spirit and moves in a direction which should, one day, prepare modern scientific thinkers to give impartial hearing to the conceptions of occult science. These may be illustrated by a nineteenth-century writer N. N. Strachof, who is quoted and commented upon by Madame Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 654):

> Strachof . . . says in his *Fundamental Conceptions of Psychology and Physiology*:—"The most clear, as the most familiar, type of development may be found in our own mental or physical evolution, which has served others as a model to follow. . . . If organisms are *entities* . . . then it is only just to conclude and assert that the organic life strives to beget psychic life; but it would be still more correct and in accordance with the spirit of these two categories of evolution to say, that *the true cause of organic life is the tendency of spirit to manifest in substantial forms, to clothe itself in substantial reality. It is the highest form which contains the complete explanation of the lowest, never the reverse.*" This is admitting . . . the identity of this mysterious, integrally acting and organizing Principle with the Self-Conscious and Inner Subject, which we call the EGO and the world at large—the Soul. Thus, gradually, all the best scientists and Thinkers are approaching the Occultists in their general conclusions.

How closely this last comment applies to Dr. Roberts may be seen from her expressed difference with the eminent English biologist Julian Huxley:

> I do not agree with him that individuals are outstanding primarily because of their genic complement provided by natural selection. The most outstanding ones appear to have in addition some sort of heightened awareness of their immortal spark and their spiritual heritage, and this attribute seems to be non-inherited and psychosocially activated.

Transcendence or Nihilism?

In an announcement of a series of "Fourth World" conferences to be held in England, under the sponsorship of a bi-monthly magazine, *Resurgence*, there is the following perceptive introduction to a session meeting to consider "Drugs and Transcendentalism":

> The "Fourth World" designates groups of people all over the world who are united by a common culture which does not conform or relate to the political structures of the state they are subject to. An entirely new cultural ethos has established itself with the younger generation—particularly among those who have grown up since the war. Broadly speaking, it appears as a kind of internationalism—the feeling that a sense of brotherhood with men everywhere is more important than one's allegiance to one's own country if that allegiance is against the interests of that brotherhood. Peculiar to the younger generation is the most recent phenomenon of the Flower People, and the so-called "Psychedelic Community" (which originated in America). Commercial enterprise has not been slow to cash in on this phenomenon: "British entrepreneurs . . . are doing quite nicely at the Crystal Palace and elsewhere out of love-ins for the kids" (*Listener,* last year), and drug-taking has been a feature out of which the press has made capital, but these superficial aspects hide a real yearning for transcendence—a need to transcend the unrelenting "succession of immediate occasions," which industrialization has forced on us professionally. What is the phenomenology of "transcendence" in this situation? Are these people "opting out"? Is the drift to the East an attempt to rediscover fundamentals of human resourcefulness or an act of nihilism, a gesture of contempt for the European heritage and technological achievement? "Human context" should be common ground between East and West, but what does it mean and can it be realized in practice?

Aids or Delusions?

These generalizations, even if a bit learned, seem to cover much of both the promise and the threat of the present cycle, of which H.P.B. wrote in her Fourth Message to the American Theosophists:

> Psychism, with all its allurements and all its dangers, is necessarily developing among you, and you must beware lest the Psychic outruns the Manasic and Spiritual development. Psychic capacities held perfectly under control, checked and directed by the Manasic principle, are valuable aids in development. But these capacities running riot, controlling instead of controlled, using instead of being used, lead the Student into the most dangerous delusions and the certainty of moral destruction. Watch therefore carefully this development, inevitable in your race and evolution-period, so that it may work for good and not for evil. . . .

"Drive in Living Matter to Perfect Itself"

Albert Szent-Gyoergyi, Nobel-Prize-winning biochemist, discusses in the *Journal of Individual Psychology* (November, 1966), the

various levels of vital organization—bacterial, chemical, molecular, mathematical, etc.—which may be studied by scientists. To illustrate one of these levels, Szent-Gyoergyi turns to the complex nervous mechanisms behind seemingly simple behavior. He describes the feeding habits of baby herring seagulls. When a baby gull wants food, it knocks at a red patch on the parent's beak. This elicits a regurgitation reflex in the mother bird, and the baby is able to take the recently caught fish from her gullet. "How could such a system develop?" asks Dr. Szent-Gyoergyi. He continues:

> The red spot would make no sense without the complex nervous mechanism of the knocking baby and that of the regurgitating mother. All this had to be developed simultaneously, which, as a random mutation, has a probability of zero. I am unable to approach this problem without supposing an innate "drive" in living matter to perfect itself.

Life Is the Builder

> I know that many of my colleagues, especially the molecular biologists, will be horrified, if not disgusted, to hear me talk about a "drive" and will call me a "vitalist," which is worse than to be called a communist. But I think that the use of such words as "drive" does no harm if we do not imagine we have found an explanation by finding a name. If we look upon such words as simply denoting great unsolved problems of science, they can even lead to useful experimentation.
>
> By "drive" I denote here simply the ability of life to maintain and improve itself. You know this from your daily life. You know well that if you use your car too much and your legs too little, your car gets worn out while your legs atrophy, just fade away. This is one of the most characteristic differences between the living and the non-living. The non-living is worn out by use, while the living is improved, developed by it. Life keeps life going, building up and improving itself, while inactivity makes it go to pieces.

"Something to Say"

Speaking in general of the "wisdom" of the organism, Dr. Szent-Gyoergyi says:

> This "wisdom" may be even much more difficult to understand than the "drive," but also must have its well-defined mechanism. Perhaps this "wisdom" and "drive" are essentially the same, and may be the property of living matter in general—the property that has driven matter to generate life, which then tends to build its own mechanisms. I feel strongly that, for instance, the human speech center was not developed by random

> mutation, but had to be developed as soon as man had something to say—the function generating its own mechanism.

This general approach to the phenomena of life recalls the thesis of a recent book by L. L. Whyte, *Internal Factors in Evolution* (Braziller, 1965). Dr. Whyte, too, is unable to believe that "random mutations" can be responsible for the wondrous processes of organic development, and proposes, on the basis of the work of several advanced biologists, that there is "an internal selection process" which "acts directly on mutations, mainly at the molecular, chromosomal, and cellular levels, in terms not of struggle and competition, but of the system's capacity for coordinated activity."

In all such gropings of men working in the life sciences, one sees a reaching after the morphogenetic functions of the astral body, as the coordinating intelligence of the living organism.

Addicted Society?

On the question of drug-taking, what is perhaps the most searching discussion that has appeared in recent years was contributed by a well-known psychoanalyst and psychiatrist, Dr. Leslie H. Farber, to the *New York Times* for Dec. 11, 1966 (and reprinted in the Winter 1968 number of the *Review of Existential Psychology & Psychiatry*). This article, titled "Ours Is the Addicted Society," finds the key defect of the times in what Dr. Farber names "the disordered will." The taking of drugs, he says, gives the illusion, "briefly and subjectively," of having "a responsible and vigorous will." Dr. Farber discusses many phases of the modern tendency to obtain through chemicals what we feel to be lacking in ourselves. Even the slang of the times reflects this manipulative view of human good, as in the phrase "Turn on." In evidence of the widespread use of drugs, Dr. Farber quotes from the Los Angeles *Times*:

> Use of illegal drugs in industry, especially among production line workers, is so common that to arrest everybody who sold or used them would mean some plants would have to hire whole new shifts of employees, according to a police narcotics specialist. The drugs most commonly used are amphetamine sulfate compounds and barbiturate derivatives, which keep workers awake, or put them to sleep.

Banish Doubts!

After speaking of why people take amphetamine—to overcome feelings of tedium, boredom, ineffectualness, and lack of drive—Dr. Farber describes the result of an experiment on himself:

> With a dose of amphetamine, . . . my self-concern, with its associated fatigue and hesitation and doubts, will vanish, so that in a single-minded way I shall vigorously engage my task. Within a few hours all the evaluations [the work at hand he had to do] will be completed. Like a schoolboy who has at the last minute finished his term paper, I shall feel relieved and virtuous to have at long last done what my organization demands of me.

Illusion Compounds Illusion

But this confident mood falsifies the accomplishment:

> Reading over my reports after I have recovered from the drug, I may be chagrined to note a breathless, assertive and yet self-indulgent quality to my writing that did not trouble me at the time.
>
> But I can counter my dissatisfaction by assuring myself these deficiencies matter very little, since I have done all that was asked of me. It was my own sin of pride that initially led me to regard my task as such an intricate and demanding responsibility. Besides, I will tell myself, wasn't it a choice between doing nothing and doing something, however imperfectly?
>
> Thus will my mood of accomplishment prevail, helping me to disown my self-criticism and perhaps persuading me, since I won't have to read those reports again, that I had indeed been discriminating in preparing them. And my earlier doubts as to whether these evaluations should have been written at all can be postponed for another time.

Process of Addiction

Later in his article, Dr. Farber turns to the cycle of the addictive course, beginning with the "subjective experience of wholeness and the pleasure accompanying it." But with continued use of the drug, "the initial feeling of well-being is difficult to duplicate precisely," and as its influence wears off "the user returns to a world which has lost none of its oppressiveness and with which, in the midst of the drug hangover, he feels less able to cope." He now finds reasons for taking drugs more frequently, and will argue to himself that they provide "an extraordinary sort of transcendence which his usual life with others cannot provide." Dr. Farber continues:

> In other words, he has been burned by the demonic and addictive notion that he need not wait on life for the transcendence he seeks, that he may evoke it whenever he so decrees or wills by returning to the drug or drugs which first allowed this remarkable feeling.
>
> With this seeming triumph of his will, he will be more im-

patient of the often frustrating give-and-take of life without drugs, willfully demanding his well-being of those about him and thereby suffering even more the penalties of such willing. In a sense he insists futilely that life now be his drug.

Needless to say, his mounting impatience will be inimical to the exercise or development of such qualities as imagination, judgment, humor, tact. And should he glimpse, however dimly, his impoverishment, he may wish to believe these qualities at least can return with drugs, disowning the evidence accumulating to the contrary.

The End in Paralysis of Will

The account continues, with attention to the many nuances of self-justification which go with enslavement to drugs. Even more valuable, however, are the analogies drawn by Dr. Farber between drug addiction and non-drug sorts of addiction, including psychological self-indulgence. Yet drugs remain the symbol of the "addictive society," and in the end, for the user—

What seemed the feeling of transcendence at the beginning has long since been abandoned as his drug goal in favor of merely getting enough from one moment to the next, in favor of mindlessly and minimally staying alive. What began with his will to decree well-being for himself without having to wait on life now culminates in almost a paralysis of will for every trivial action, even getting dressed or feeding himself.

A Chemical God

One sees, in the light of this discussion, why those who seek the spiritual life have always been counseled by their teachers to practice self-restraint and self-reliance, and to recognize in natural asceticism the path to freedom and the greatest usefulness to others. Dr. Farber concludes by pointing to the consequences of an egotism which assumes that nature and its resources have no other purpose than to serve our own benefit and enjoyment:

Out of disbelief we have impudently assumed that all life is now subject to our own will. And the disasters that have come from willing what cannot be willed have not at all brought us to some modesty about our presumptions. Instead, we have turned to chemicals, which seem to enhance our willful strivings. It was only a question of time before man, in his desperation, would locate divinity in drugs and on that artificial rock build his church.

In all such persuasions, personal euphoria—"feeling good"—is the objective, and may be seen as nothing more than a concentrated

"allurement" of the psychic nature. What susceptibility could be more vulnerable to the indulgences made possible by a science which combines chemistry and physiology to simulate the "happiness" so many people in our time believe is their "right" and only important goal?

Impoverished by Progress

George R. Stewart's lasest book, *Not So Rich As You Think* (Houghton Mifflin), is filled with evidence of what happens when progress is achieved by technically efficient specialists who do not "take full responsibility for their actions." Mr. Stewart, who also wrote *Fire* and *Storm,* compiles a horror story of the pollution of the world by the ruthless methods of modern industry. In the first chapter he predicts that a future historian will one day say of the present "affluent" society: "Of the waters, they made a cesspool; of the air a depository for poisons; and of the good earth itself, a dump where rats nuzzled in piles of refuse." The rest of his book tells the story of waters tainted by sewage and factory effluents, of earth increasingly burdened and defaced by garbage, junk, litter, and agricultural and mineral refuse, and of air poisoned by smoke, smog, and radioactive wastes.

An instance of the extent to which the Atlantic Ocean has been contaminated by polluted inland waters appears in *Science* for March 1. A study of the declining reproduction of the Bermuda petrel reveals the presence of residues of DDT in eggs and chicks. "Concentrations of residues," says the writer, "are similar to those in certain terrestrial carnivorous birds whose productivity is also declining." Since the breeding grounds of the Bermuda petrel—already reduced to a population of about 100—are on isolated and uninhabited islets never treated with DDT, and since these birds feed only in the sea, it follows that "the presence of DDT residues in all samples can lead only to the conclusion that the oceanic food chain, presumably including the plankton, is contaminated."

Erratum

In THEOSOPHY for May (page 205, fourth line from bottom) *for* Jesus' *read* Paul's. The statement referred to appears in Galatians 6:7, where Paul writes: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."